

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-17 are all the claims currently pending.

By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-10, 13 and 15-17 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment.

### **II. Response To Objections To The Drawings**

The Examiner states that Figures 8-10 should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art" because only that which is old is illustrated in the figures. The Applicant has amended Figs. 8-10, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Enclosed are Replacement Sheets of Figs. 8-10 in which Figs. 8-10 include a "Prior Art" legend.

### **III. Response To Objections To The Specification**

The Examiner alleges that the title of the invention is not descriptive and, as such, a new title is required. Accordingly, the Applicant has amended the title to more particularly point out that the present invention is directed to "controlling an image input apparatus."

### **IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-4, 7-12, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA. Additionally, claims 5, 6, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA as applied to claims 1-4, 7-12, and 15-17 and further in view of Ejima. The Applicant traverses the above rejections for the following reasons.

According to the present invention as described in claim 1, when a request is input to the image input apparatus, the route determination unit selects either the sending unit which sends the request to the host or the processing unit which processes the request within the image input apparatus with reference to the correspondence data, (stored in the memory) which corresponds to a request type and destination. By sending only the request needed by the host to the host, it is possible to reduce the lag time between the input request by the user to the processing of the input request by the image input apparatus, as well as reduce the processing load of the host.

In the AAPA, when the local control mode is selected, a request is processed within the image input apparatus without being sent to the host. When the host control mode is selected, a request is always sent to the host. In this manner, the request, whose information is not needed by the host, is also sent to the host. Thus, the load of the host increases uselessly.

Further, no destination information corresponding to a request type is needed for routing the request in AAPA, because the destination corresponds to the selected mode (local control mode or host control mode). More specifically, the destination (or route) is fixed either to Fig. 8 (local control mode) or to Fig. 10 (host control mode) regardless of a request type when either the local control mode or the host control mode is selected.

Based on the foregoing, the memory for storing correspondence data of a request type and destination as disclosed in claim 1 is not taught or suggested by AAPA.

Further, there is no need in AAPA to determine if a request should be routed to one of the sending unit and the processing unit since the route is fixed either to Fig. 6 to Fig. 8 in accordance with the set mode and regardless of a request type. Therefore, the route determination unit, which routes the request in accordance with the request type with reference to the correspondence data stored in the memory is not taught or suggested by AAPA.

In Ejima, column 34, line 63 to column 35, line 7 discloses that the information processing device detects the connection/disconnection of a communication line to another information processing device, then records the image transmitted by the other information processing device when the connection is detected. The device records the image input by itself when the connection not detected.

Accordingly, the Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 9 and 17, as well as their respective dependent claims, are patentable over AAPA, Ejima, and combination thereof.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of the application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4717.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4717.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 12/16/04

By: Mark D. Pratt  
Mark D. Pratt  
Registration No. 45,794  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101